AGENDA: State Collaborative for Children System of Care CHAIRPERSONS: Joel Rosch and Pat Solomon LOCATION: Child Advocacy Institute

DATE: 10/8/04 START TIME: 9:00 am

END TIME: 11:00a.m.

NAME	PRESENT	NAME	PRESENT	NAME	PRESENT
Ali Avery, AOC/Drug Tx		Jan Hood, AOC		Mike Lancaster, DMHDDSAS	X
Al Deitch, DOA-YA&I		Jennifer Mahan, MHANC	X	Mike Mosley DHHS	
Alicia Graham, DMHDDSAS		Jennifer Sullivan, NASW		Pat Solomon, NC Families United Co Chair	X
Austin Connors, CFSA- NC/Kathy Dobbs		Joann Haggerty, NC CAI	X	Rebecca Huffman, DSS	
Barb Bradley, NCCAI	X				
Brad Trotter, DHOH-DMH		Joel Rosch, CCFP Co- Chair	X	Sally Cameron, NCPA	
Carol Duncan-Clayton,		John Tote, MHA		Susan Eller, School	X
CCP				Psychology Association	
Carol Robertson, DMA		Judy Ritchie, MHA		Susan Robinson, DMH-CF	
Carol Tant, WCHS		Kathy Klutz, WCH		Susan Whitten, DJJDP	
Charlotte Craver, Value Options		Kirstin Frescoln, AOC	X	Terri Grant, SOC MH/DD/SAS	
Cheryl Waller, CSHS		Lana Dial, AOC		Tina Howard, GCC	
Christine Trottier, Carolina Legal Assistance	X				
Cyndie Bennett, Office of		Larry Hayes		Tom Smith, DSS	X
Education Services					
Debra McHenry, DPI		Linda Swann, NAMI		Virginia Pirelli, DJJDP	
Deborah Carroll, DPH		Lisa Rabin, NC Carolina Legal Assistance		Others in Attendence	
Diann Irwin, DPI		Marie Britt, DMA		David Atkinson, NC DSS Child Welfare	X
Don Willis, MHDDSAS		Martha Lowrance, YA&I	X	Gary Ander, Alamance DSS SOC	X
Donn Hargrove, DJJDP	X	Martin Pharr, DJJDP		Jeff Quinn, Duke	X
Earl Marett, DSS		Michael Owens, NCCCP	X	May Alexander, Duke	X
Esther High, DSS		Michael Schweitzer, DJJDP		Shawn Parker, NCGA	X
Flo Stein, DMHDDSAS		Michelle Zechmann, GCC		Verla Insko, NCGA	X
TODY C					
TOPIC	DISCUSSION/FINDINGS		Action by Whom and V	vnen	
(1) Welcome & Introductions Pat and Joel	Welcomed frequent attendees and extended special welcome to guest members, Verla Insko and Mr. Parker.				
(2) Review of minutes	Minutes were reviewed and approved. One correction Martha Lowrance attended				
(3) Common Outcomes/evaluation Joel	May Alexander, Jeff Quinn, Joel Rosch and David Atkinson shared the work Duke is completing looking at what kinds of data and reports each agency is currently collecting/reporting. As May and Jeff spoke with agencies they discovered some of the concerns enumerated below particularly around concerns of shared information and funding.			Report is due in October. • Agencies need to identify what are collecting related to the ochild well-being.	

(4)Legislative interest in collaboration Guests, Mike, Joel The group discussed ways in which the General Assembly could support collaboration for children with multiple service needs. • Should the GA legislate some "common outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. • What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to	aboration	Assembly could support collaboration for children with multiple service needs. • Should the GA legislate some "common outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. • What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	4 to begin discussion of improving ation for children with multiple needs. and money are akin to the soner's dilemma." When agencies wer questions in relation to "what is for me?" everybody loses. We need up thinking as agencies and begin
with multiple service needs. Should the GA legislate some "common outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJIDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		with multiple service needs. Should the GA legislate some "common outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	ation for children with multiple needs. and money are akin to the coner's dilemma." When agencies wer questions in relation to "what is for me?" everybody loses. We need up thinking as agencies and begin
 Should the GA legislate some "common outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to 		 Should the GA legislate some "common outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	and money are akin to the coner's dilemma." When agencies wer questions in relation to "what is for me?" everybody loses. We need up thinking as agencies and begin
outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. • What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		 outcomes" and then hold each agency responsible for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	oner's dilemma." When agencies ver questions in relation to "what is for me?" everybody loses. We need op thinking as agencies and begin
 for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to 		for achieving that outcome? High school graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	oner's dilemma." When agencies ver questions in relation to "what is for me?" everybody loses. We need up thinking as agencies and begin
graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJIDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		graduation is an example of a shared outcome for which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. • What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	oner's dilemma." When agencies ver questions in relation to "what is for me?" everybody loses. We need up thinking as agencies and begin
which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJDP and DMHDDSAS. • What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		which all agencies have a shared responsibility from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. • What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	rer questions in relation to "what is for me?" everybody loses. We need op thinking as agencies and begin
from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJIDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		from public health (pregnancy and early childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. • What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	for me?" everybody loses. We need op thinking as agencies and begin
childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		 childhood) through DJJDP and DMHDDSAS. What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	op thinking as agencies and begin
 What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to 		 What are the implications of an "entitlement" to an outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	
outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? • There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		 outcome (services) versus a process (child and family team meetings/IEP meetings)? There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	
 There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to 		 There is confusion about the idea of a "person centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	
centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		 centered plan." It should mean that there is only one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	
one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		 one person/family and only one plan that any and all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	
all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		 all agencies and supports contribute to rather than five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders 	
five separate person centered plans. Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		five separate person centered plans. • Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	
 Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to 		Does failure to share information hinder collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	
collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		collaboration? Are there particular statutes that hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	
hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		hinder data sharing that can and should be changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	
changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders agencies from sharing information? • Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? • Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		changed? Is it fear of legal reprisal that hinders	
 agencies from sharing information? Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to 			
 Are agencies reluctant to collaborate and share information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to 		aganaiaa frama ahanin a infamaati 9	
information because they fear losing funding? Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
Should the GA place all child funds in a single line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to		<u> </u>	
line-item as they have done in LA? Is there a middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
middle ground where we can "blend" funding? Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
Is there sufficient funding to support collaboration? Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
Collaboration will provide better outcomes and save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
save money but initially it is a time and conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
conceivably resource intensive venture. Is there the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
the political will and sufficient safeguards to			
I provide the funds needed to achieve the desired		provide the funds needed to achieve the desired	
outcomes?			
• If we ask the GA to legislate collaboration will we			
end up with legislation and a system that is worse			
rather than better?			
(5) Notification of out of • Notification is still not happening consistently but • Group asked whether we should try to	Notification of out of		asked whether we should try to
county placements is happening more often than it used to occur. "fix" notification problem or simply do	ity placements		
Group, Mike • SB163 was a multipart bill that included; best we can until Reform takes hold.	ıp, Mike	• SB163 was a multipart bill that included; best w	ve can until Reform takes hold.
notification of impacted agencies when a child was • Need to work towards goal of good cris			to work towards goal of good crisis
moved out of his/her community, group home services within every community/coun			
licensure, and developing a plan/feasibility study and local group homes so that when it is			
for data collection. What happened to the data necessary for a child/youth to be placed			
collection part of the bill? It resided between DPI of home s/he can remain within the			
and DMHDDSAS. community/county.			nunity/county.
How has education money followed or not followed shildren?			
followed children? (8) State Collaborative	State Collaborativo		
Sub-committees:			
Training Training Committee will review a web-based Training Committee meets Oct. 19 9:00			ng Committee meets Oct 10 0:00
training/orientation program developed for 11:00 at NC CFSA	iiiig		
Buncombe SOC. Discussion centered around			
whether all agencies could agree on a single basic			
training module that introduced a shared vision of			
"person centered plans" and other core principles			
that all agencies state they share. The single		that all agencies state they share. The single	
training module would arm all child and family		training module would arm all child and family	
workers (teachers, court counselors, CBS workers,		workers (teachers, court counselors, CBS workers,	
foster care workers, etc) with a common			

Evaluations Assessment	vocabulary and understanding of "one child, one family, and one plan". • Actively working to look at evaluation and shared outcome criteria. • Has not met.	• Evaluation Sub meets Oct. 15 1:30 – 3:30 at CAI
School Based	Continues to meet actively. Have sent out a survey across state. Will have recommendations in November.	
(9) Community Partners Updates		
(10) Agenda Items for future meetings	Cultural Competence – Sharon Glover CORE – Mike Moseley, Director of MH/DD/SAS	
(11) Next meeting	October 22, 2004 9:00 – 11:00 GCC	

It's about children and families in their homes, schools, and communities.

